

App. Serial No.: 10/614,606  
Atty. Docket No.: P2415

### REMARKS

These remarks are in response to the Office Action dated August 7, 2008, which has a shortened statutory period for response set to expire November 7, 2008. A one-month extension, to expire December 8, 2008 (December 7, 2008 being a Sunday), is requested in a petition filed herewith.

#### Interview Summary

A telephone interview was held on November 7, 2008 between Applicant's attorney, Larry E. Henneman, Jr., and Examiner Ryan F. Pitaro. Mr. Henneman and Examiner Pitaro discussed the rejections of pending Claims 1-45 presented in the final Office Action dated August 7, 2008.

First, Mr. Henneman indicated that Claims 14-15 and 29-30 should not be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 7,124,374 (Haken). Examiner Pitaro agreed, and indicated that Claims 14-15 and 29-30 should have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Haken in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,842,795 (Keller).

Next, Mr. Henneman and Examiner Pitaro discussed the 35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections over Haken in view of Keller as they pertained to the current independent Claims 1, 31, 38, 39, 40, and 42. After discussing the combination of the prior art, Examiner Pitaro and Mr. Henneman agreed on several points regarding the Keller reference. First, Examiner Pitaro and Mr. Henneman agreed that Keller discloses in detail an external relative pointing device that moves a cursor from a screen of one device to the screen of another device. Furthermore, agreement was reached that, even though Keller discloses the possible use of two PDAs in the summary and beginning of the detailed description, Keller does not explicitly disclose remapping an absolute input device. Examiner Pitaro and Mr. Henneman also agreed that Keller does not inherently disclose remapping an absolute input device, because remapping the touch-screen input device of one PDA to the touch screen of another PDA would be impractical. In particular, such an implementation would be impractical because it would be extremely difficult for a user to control a second PDA by tapping with a stylus on the first PDA's touch screen. Furthermore, if an image of the second PDA's touch screen were transmitted back to the first PDA, then Keller would not include a plurality of active displays.

App. Serial No.: 10/614,606  
Atty. Docket No.: P2415

Examiner Pitaro and Mr. Henneman also agreed on amendments to independent Claims 1, 31, 38, 39, 40, and 42 that would overcome the current rejections. With respect to Claims 1, 31, 39, 40, and 42, Mr. Henneman suggested amending "pointing device" in those claims to "absolute input device" to overcome the current rejections. Examiner Pitaro agreed that such amendments would overcome the rejections of those claims. Regarding Claim 38, Mr. Henneman suggested changing the phrase "remap the pointing device" to "remap the position monitor." The Examiner also indicated that such an amendment would overcome the current rejection of Claim 38. Finally, Examiner Pitaro indicated that he would have to do an updated search in view of the amendments.

Mr. Henneman sincerely thanks Examiner Pitaro for the cooperative nature of the interview and for his constructive assistance in advancing the prosecution of this case.

#### Claims

Claims 1-45 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-45 are rejected over prior art. Claims 1-15, 31, 33, 36, and 38-42 are amended and Claims 16-30 remain as previously presented. Claims 32, 34-35, 37, and 43-45 remain as filed. Reconsideration is requested.

#### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 14-15 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,124,374 (Haken). Claims 1-11, 16-26, 31-33, and 37-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Haken in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,842,795 (Keller). Claims 12-13, 27-28, and 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Haken and Keller in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,990,893 (Numazaki).

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

The claims are amended herein according to agreements reached in the interview held on November 7, 2008 between the Examiner and Applicant's attorney. As discussed above, the amendments made to independent Claims 1, 31, 38, 39, 40, and 42 overcome the current rejections of those claims. Therefore, Claims 1, 31, 38, 39, 40, and 42 are now in condition for allowance. Because each of Claims 2-30, 32-37, 41, and 43-45 depend from a respective one of

App. Serial No.: 10/614,606

Atty. Docket No.: P2415

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
DEC 08 2008**

Claims 1, 31, 38, 39, 40, and 42, Claims 2-30, 32-37, 41, and 43-45 are also now in condition for allowance.

For the above reasons Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant believes that Claims 1-45 are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner undertake any action other than allowance of Claims 1-45, or if the Examiner has any questions or suggestions for expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's attorney at (269) 279-8820.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/8/08



Larry E. Henneman, Jr., Reg. No. 41,063  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Henneman & Associates, PLC  
714 W. Michigan Ave.  
Three Rivers, MI 49093

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION (37 CFR 1.8(a))**

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via facsimile, on the date shown below, to: MS RCE, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, at (571) 273-8300.

Date: 12/8/08

  
Larry E. Henneman, Jr.